श्री राजीव शुक्ल: सर,यह गलत बात है न। ... (**व्यवधान**) ... यह बड़ी गंभीर बात है। ... (**व्यवधान**) ... यह तो गलत बात है कि दस्तखत भी करो, पैसे भी लो और उसके बाद बहिष्कार भी करो। ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

श्री वी0 हनुमंत राव (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : सर, दस्तखत भी कर रहे हैं ओर बाहर सैट्रल हाल में खाना भी खा रहे हैं।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: सैट्रल हॉल में खाना बेशक खा लें लेकिन यहां दस्तखत करके हाउस में नहीं आरहे और बायकॉट भी कर रहें हैं। ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

श्री विद्या सागर निषाद (बिहार): उपसभापति महोदय ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप बैठिए प्लीज़। ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

श्री विद्या सागर निषाद: यह कैसे माना जाएगा कि वे बहिष्कार किए हुए हैं इससे तो यह साबित होता है कि वे देश को ... (**व्यवधान**) ...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए। ... (**व्यवधान**) ... ऐसे नहीं चलेगा। आप बोलए मंत्री जी।

GOVERNMENT BILL

The Coastal Aquaculture Authority Bill, 2004

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND THE MINISTER OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the establishment of a Coastal Aquaculture Authority for regulating the activities connected with coastal aquaculture in the coastal areas and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

महोदय,यह छोटा बिल है मगर खास तौर पर सागर के किनारे वाले जो लोग है और ऐक्वाकल्चर की लाइन में है, उनके लिए तथा देश के ऐक्सपोर्ट के लिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बिल है। देश के सागर के किनारों पर, खास तौर पर ईस्टर्न कोस्ट पर और उसमें भी ज्यादातर आंध्र प्रदेश, तमिलनाडु केरल ऐसे राज्यों में ऐक्वाकल्चर फार्म के माध्यम से shrimps का उत्पादन बड़े पैमाने पर होता है। पिछले साल देश का इस क्षेत्र का एक्सपोर्ट 6000 करोड़ का है और इस 6000 करोड़ में 80 प्रतिशत ऐक्सपोर्ट Shrimps का ऐक्सपोर्ट है, जिसके मध्यम से रोजगार भी बहुत पैदा होता है और देश को कीमती फॉरेन ऐक्सचेंज भी मिलता है। हमारे देश में टोटल कोस्टल एरिया में जहां ऐक्वाकल्चर कर सकते हैं, ऐसा क्षेत्र 12 लाख हैक्टेयर के आस-पास है और आज तक इनमें से सिर्फ 14 प्रतिशत क्षेत्र इस काम के लिए इस्तेमाल होता है, बाकी क्षेत्र का अभी तक हम लोगों ने इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है क्योंकि बीच में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कुछ ऐसे डिसीजन ले लिए,

environment को, पर्यावरण को प्रोटैक्शन देने के लिए जिनकी आवश्यकता थी। मगर उनके सामने एक ऐप्लीकेशन था, रिट ऐप्लीकेशन था, 561 ऑफ 1994, जिनका निर्णय दिसम्बर, 1994 में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने दिया। इसमें तीन बातें सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने खास तौर पर कहींथीं। पहली, ऐक्वाकल्चर इंडस्ट्री जो है वह कोस्टल रेग्यूलेशन जोन, सीआरजे नोटिफिकेशन, जो फरवरी, 1991में Environment Protection Act के मुताबिक निकाला था, वह ऐक्वाकलचर फार्म पर भी लागू है। दूसरा, आज सागर के किनारे shrimps फार्म को रेग्युलेट करने के लिए अथॉरिटी की नियुक्ति करने की आवश्यकता है। तीसरा, जो बड़ा गंभीर मुद्दा था, जितने एग्जिस्टिंग फार्म्स थे, उनको demolish करने के बारे में भी सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने सूचना दी थी । इस आदेश के बारे में एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री सुप्रीम कोर्ट में एक रिव्यू पिटीशन लेकर गई। बाद में इस रिव्यू पिटीशन को कोर्ट ने स्टे ऑर्डर दिया और इसका फाइनल डिसीजन अभी आना बाकी है। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के आदेश के मुताबिक एक्वाकल्चर अथॉरिटी under the Chairmanship of a High Court judge has already been set up with Chennai as its Headquarters. सरकार की यह राय हैकि सुप्रीम कर्ट ने एक्वावल्चर को जो इंडस्ट्री की कैटगरी में रखा गया है, वह ठीक नहीं है। इसलिए 1997 में सरकार एक्वाकल्चर अथॉरिटी बिल राज्य सभा में लाई थी और राज्य सभा में वह पास भी हुआ था। उस बिल की जब लोक सभा में जाने की स्थिति पैदा हुई, तब लोक सभा ही भंग हो गई और इसलिए वह बिल ऐसी परिस्थिति में रहा। उसी समय, जून-जुलाई, 1997 में आसपास तेरह संसद सदस्य जो अलग-अलग पार्टियों के थे, उन्होंने इन सभी कोस्टल एरियाज में जाकर वहां के ऑफिसर्स, फिशरमैन ऑर्गेनाइजेशन और लोकल पॉपुलेशन से बातचीत की और उनकी राय shrimp कल्चर के पक्ष में बनी। उसे रेग्युलर करने के लिए कानून की आवश्यकता है, इस तरह की राय उन्होंने सरकार को दी। फरवरी, 2000 में एक्वाकल्चर अथॉरिटी बिल राज्य सभा में लाया गया और वह लाने के बाद, उसे स्टेडिंग कमेटी ऑन एग्रीकल्चर के पास भेजा गया। दिसम्बर,2000 में स्टैडिंग कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी और उस रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक और अन्य संगठनों के माध्यम से बहुत से सुझाव सरकार के पास आए जिससे उस बिल में अमेंडमेंट की आवश्यकता लगी। इतने बड़े पैमाने पर इन जो अमेंडमेंट्स को स्वीकार करना मुश्किल हो गया था,ज्याद अमेंडमेंट्स आ गई थीं-तो कब मिनिस्टर साहब थे, उन्होंने देश के, इस क्षेत्र में संबधित लोगों को निमंत्रित किया और उनके जो-जो सुझाव थे,उनके बारे में बड़ी गहराई से डिसकशन किया। उनके जो अच्छे सुझाव थे, उनको स्वीकार उनके बारे में बड़ी गहराई से डिसकशन किया। उनके जो अच्छे सुझाव थे, उनको उन्होंने स्वीकार किया। अगर ये सब अमेंडमेंट इस परिस्थिति में लाये गए तो बिल में बहुत ही बदलाव हो जाएगा, इसलिए सरकार ने यह तय किया कि जो बिल पार्लियामेंट में लाया गया है, उसे वापस लिया जाए और एक कोस्टल एक्वाकल्चर अथॉरिटी बिल इंट्रोडयूस करने की बात तय हो गई, जिसमें पर्यावरण को कोई बाधा नहीं आएगी। खास तौर पर, यह नया बिल, जो आज इस सदन के सामने आया है, इसमें सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने जो गाइडलाइन दी है कि environment protection पर ज्यादा ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है, इसको इसमें पूरी तरह से स्वीकार किया गया है। साथ-साथ, जो

कोस्टल एरियाज़ में रहने वाले ट्रेडिशनल फिशरमैन और किसान है, इन पर भी कुछ बुरा असर नहीं होगा, इसकी ओर भी ध्यान दिया गया है। इस बिल में सरकार के पास एक गाइडलाइन तैयार करने का अधिकार दिया है, जिससे पर्यावरण की रक्षा करने में मदद हो सकती है। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने पर्यावरण की रक्षा करने के बारे में जो कहा था, इसका पूरा ध्यान इस बिल में रखा गया है। साथ-साथ यह भी स्पष्ट किया गया है कि एक्वाकल्चर कोई उद्योग नहीं है, इसलिए सी0 आर0 जेड0 का नोटिफिकेशन उनके ऊपर ऐप्लीकेबल नहीं हो सकता, यह बात भी साफ की है। इससे इस बिल में एक्वाकल्चर अथॉरिटी का स्टेटयूटरी बेस मिलेगा और अपने functions करने के लिए उनको ज्यादा ताकत मिल सकती है । पर्यावरण की रक्षा करने के लिए और हाई टाइड लेवल के 200 मीटर तक जो एक्वाकल्चर एक्टिविटी को बैन करने का सुझाव था, इसको स्वीकार किया गया है, मगर साथ-साथ कई सालों से कुछ लोगों के जो एग्ज़िस्टिंग फार्म्स वहां है, उनको ठीक तरह से देखकर उनको प्रोटैक्ट करने का भी प्रावधान इस बिल में किया गया है । इसमें एक रजिस्ट्रेशन की पद्धति कोस्वीकार किया गया है, उसे बहुत सिम्पल किया है और दो हैक्टेयर या दो हैक्टेयर से नीचे वाले जितने फार्म्स है, इनको इसमें एक तरह से मदद करने की तैयारी की है। यह सब देखने के बाद सुप्रीम कोर्ट की जो डिज़ायर थी, उनके जो आदेश थे, उनको पूरी तरह से स्वीकार भी किया गया। पर्यावरण की रक्षा करने के लिए इसमें प्रोविज़न भी किया गया है, सिस्टम को सिम्पल भी किया गया है और साथ-साथ कोस्टल एरियाज़ में यह रोज़ी का एक अच्छा माध्यम हो सकता है, इसको बढ़ावा देने की तैयारी भी सरकार ने की है। इससे एक्सपोर्ट भी बढ़ेगा, इस ओर भी सरकार ने ध्यान दिया है। मुझे विश्वास है कि सदन इसको स्वीकार करेगा और बिल को पास करेगा ।

The question was proposed.

SHRI PENUMALLI MADHU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, this Bill which is trying to regulate aquaculture has got some importance for various reasons. The aims and objectives of the Government are explained in this Bill. If we want to really achieve those objectives in this form, it will not help. So, my submission to this hon. House and to the Minister is this. The main trend of the bill is, it is trying to regulate aquaculture. It is good, and we have to regulate it. But the Ministry is not taking the responsibility of safeguarding the interests of the peasantry through this Bill. That particular aspect has been very much neglected in this Bill. Our Minister has properly explained how that the last seven or eight years this Bill has been under discussion. Once it was passed, but again in new Bill is introduced.

What is the main lacuna that is very much expressed in this Bill? It is not taking the responsibility of protecting the interests of the farmers as far as the functions of the Regulatory Authority, which are explained in this Bill, are concerned. There are two asepcts in this Bill. One is functions of

the Authority, and the other one is the powers of the Central Government to take measures to protect the environment, it is true that it is trying to protect the environment. But, it has left the peasantry without any protection. For example, for the last 15 years, it has been a very big activity that is taking place in the coastal areas of Andhra Pradesh/Tamil Nadu and Kerala. From the experience in these States it can be seen that the farmers of aquaculture are facing a big problem of spurious seed supply. All bogus companies are supplying spurious seeds, and the authorities are unable to prosecute them.This is with regard to seed.

Then comes the issue of feed. Feed is an important aspect. Feed is very much adulterated. Adulterated and contaminated feed is being supplied. Very big multinational companies have amassed huge amounts of money, but, it is at the cost of the farmers. These companies are earning huge amounts and in this Bill no checkmate is provided to check these spurious seed and feed suppliers. This is one aspect that has to be taken care of and incorporated in this Bill. The second aspect is, after 10 years of aquaculture cultivation, the major problem that we are facing is the virus, which has spread all over the coastal areas. Virus is a very big problem now. The Ministry has not taken any responsibility for research and for providing medicines. The local companies, with coloured water and some sort of chemicals, are supplying these medicines at exorbitant rates. So, there are no proper medicines, no research, no proper seed supply, no proper feed supply. With all these things, the expected aim cannot be achieved through this Bill. This is my first submission, Sir.

Then, our hon. Minister said that the Supreme Court has announced that this is an industry. We do not know what their argument is. It is very difficult to understand their argument. It is true that it is an agriculture-allied activity. Only peasantry is cultivating aquaculture. The main problem is this. Exports worth Rs. 6000 crores are being done through this activity. We are earning so much of foreign exchange because of aquaculture. Though we ara earning so much of foreign exchange, in the last 2-3 years, in some ares in Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh, many aquaculture farms have been closed becuase of no remunerative price, no mechanism, for produce of the preasantry. So, the NABARD has properly characterised aquaculture as an agriculture-allied activity. My sincere submission to this House is, when we are bringing forward this Bill, we have to take the responsibility, the Government has to take the responsibility for providing remunerative prices, seeds, feeds and various medicines. Then, checkmates should also be there. This is my submission, Sir. Thank you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Coastal Aquaculture Authority Bill, 2004.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Okay, Sir. Sir, the hon. Minister has explained the background with which this Bill has been brought in this House, I don't want to dilate much on that issue. But, Sir, as the hon. Member from the CPM has mentioned about spurious feed, seeds and all, it is a fact that aquaculture in our country, especially in the coastal areas, has to be regualted. That is the main object and reasons of this Bill. Actually, Sir, what happened is, when some of the multinational companies, some of the big investors found that there is a huge money in that—in the international market they are fetching good price—they started doing aquaculture on the coastal areas using even the agriculture land which was there on the coastal side. They made good money for 3-4 years, and, thereafter, when they did not get remunerative price, they closed down those aquaculture farms. And, Sir, it takes minimum of 30 years for reclamation of their land; otherwise, the land cannot be used for agriculture again, and it will become a waste land. Therefore, Sir, this issue was considered. In Tamil Nadu and in most areas of Andhra Pradesh, Nellur and other places, this issue became a big problem. Because the big business people who invested money to make huge profits used fertilisers beyond the required quantity, it polluted the entire coastal area. This was the main reason for which this has to be regulated.

As far as the present Bill which has been brought by the hon. Minister is concerned, he has very categorically mentioned that there are two important things, one is about regulating the coastal aquaculture, and the other is, for small farms of about two hectares, the exemption can be given by the Authority, if it is required. They may not be able to fulfil all the conditions which have been enumerated and brought. Then, Sir, I would tike to bring to the kind notice of the hon. Minister the recent developments, the Tsunami-effect in the coastal area. Sir, due to Tsunami, which hit on December 26th, 2004, the sea-water went up to three kilometres. The area of the Costal Regulation Zone is 200 metres beyond the high tides and, thereafter, 500 metres, as per the Coastal Regulation Zone that has been approved by the Ministry of Environment and Forests. Now, Sir, in such a case when the water goes up to three kilometres, what are they going to do if there is another Tsunami? The people are saying that it may come or it may not come. But, Sir, seeing the kind of earthquakes that are

taking place in Sumatra and also in Andaman and Nicobar Islands, we have to be very careful. I agree, Sir, with the hon. Minister's view that the aquaculture farms shold be on the coastal line, because the flow of water should be there. They have to use the saline water for the aquaculture farm and regulation is very much required. But we have also to see the dangers involved as a result of Tsunami-effect. I request the hon. Minister to consider the very important point which the other hon. Member has also mentioned that spurious feed is being supplied by various companies without any regulation, without regulatory system, and the seed which are farmers get is also infected. Some of the small farmers who have been having two hectares or even three hectares, or, two ponds or three ponds, have committed suicides in the coastal areas. Therefore, this is a very serious matter. While regualting the aquaculture farms, I would like to request the hon. Minister to consider that aspect also.

There is one other lacuna which I want the hon. Minister to consider. When anyone applies for permission for the purpose of having an aquaculture farm, especially, the companies or individuals who would like to have aquaculture in their lands, then the permission is denied by the Aquaculture Authority. Where is the Appellate forum? The Bill is silent on this aspect. Sir, the Bill has mentioned that the Authority may refuse to renew—it is in Clause 13 at page six of the Bill; it has been mentioned with regard to renewal—the registration of a farm. Suppose, Sir, some of the authorities even without following the guidelines refuse permission to get a registration or even a renewal. Sir, I am quoting here what the clause says. It is said, "The Authority may refuse to renew the registration of a farm under sub-section (10) if the Authority is satisfied that the person to whom such registration is made has failed to utilise such farms." This is for refusal, refusing the renewal, if they are not using it. Then, I go to the original provision, *i.e.,* Clause 13, sub-clause (1), *i.e.,* regarding Registration for Coastal Aquaculture. Sir, if the Authority refuses the permission, where is the remedy? They cannot go to the court because going to the court has been banned under the Act itself. Sir, I would like to know what is the provision, the remedy they have for the people who have applied and who have not been given permission after due investment, after making all the preparations. Sir, if they are not giving permission, what will happen? Sir, I would like to submit that countries like China, Japan and Peru, etc., are thriving in aquaculture. They have very good technology/China is No. 1 in aquaculture, even today, and has remained so for the last several years. One cannot ignore that type of activity in the coastal areas because it is providing us very good foreign exchange. Apart from that, the allied

industries, the processing units, are also thriving in the coastal areas. It gives employment to millions of people in the coastal areas. Therefore, Sir, this industry, this area of operation, cannot be ignored. But it needs to be regulated. That is the idea with which the hon. Minister has brought forth the Bill.

Now, very huge investments are being made. The authority, by which it is going to be regulated, would it be a Central Government authority or that of the State Government? In the Bill which you have brought before the House, are you providing for the authority to be given to the State Government, or, does the power rest with the Central Government? ...*(interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is not only Tamil Nadu; there are other coastal States as well, like Andhra Pradesh ...*(interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanasamy is veryjudicious ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, normally implementation has to be done by the State Government and not by the Central Government ...*(interruptions)*... The State Government of Tamil Nadu is not doing it. What can be done? ...*(interruptions)*...

Sir, while giving the powers, and while framing the rules, I want the hon. Minister to specify those provisions, so that necessary safeguards could be made, because, people are investing huge amounts of money in aquaculture. There should be proper regulations for protecting them, and also the people, especially the fishing community, fishermen living in the coastal areas, should be protected. It is like a weapon that can be used for protecting people involved in aquaculture and also the farming community. I hope the hon. Minister will consider that aspect, because it is not only income generating, but also an employment-generating activity. Therefore, I want the hon. Minister to take care of this.

The Bill, which has been brought forth, has been pending since 1996. It was brought in 2000, but withdrawn thereafter. Though it was passed in the Rajya Sabha, it was withdrawn from the Lok Sabha. The people who are involved in aquaculture, leave alone big investment holders, the farmers who have been doing it, have been suffering because either the fishermen community or the people living there, in the name of associations, prevent them from doing the activity. Therefore, those people also need protection. What is your plan regarding implementation? Will it be through a State agency? Secondly, where is the appellate provision for the people when

they are denied permission to start an aquaculture unit in their area?

With these words, I support the Bill and I support the hon. Minister in this regard. Thank you. Sir.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala): Thank you Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir. This Bill is intended for the establishment of a coastal aquaculture authority. Also, this is a long-pending problem because of the intervention of the Supreme Court by its order declaring that aquaculture as an industry comes within the purview of the Notification of the Government of India, more particularly, the Ministry of Environment and Forests, in 1991. Because of that order these problems have arisen. Now the hon. Minister is assuring this House that all the environmental issues have been taken care of in this Bill. Also, it has been said that this Bill was sent to the Standing Committee for detailed examination and taking into consideration almost all the recommendations made by the Committee, this Bill has been brought before this House.

Sir, the main problem, which I would like to cite, is that most of the times, coastal aquaculture is creating very serious environmental repercussions in the coastal areas. In almost all places, it is seen that the mangroves built for protecting the coastal land are being destroyed and aquaculture farms have been created. That, really, is one of the reasons for the sea erosion, which is creating so many problems. Salinity of the land is also a very serious problem. The re-conversion of aquaculture land for some other purpose seems to be very difficult. The problem of drinking water is a serious problem at so many places. In Tamil Nadu itself, four or six villages have been adversely affected so far as this problem of drinking water is concerned. My submission is that the Government must ensure that the coastal environment should be protected in a proper way, and this assurance has to come from the Ministry. The question before us is: Whether Aquaculture Authority Bill is sufficient to meet the requirement of coastal environment protection? Sir, the main authority, which is being enunciated in the Bill, is the Coastal Aquaculture Authority consisting of ten members—one Chairman and nine experts from the various fields. One person is from the Ministry of Environment and so many other experts are also there. I would like to mention Clauses 3 and 11. On a perusal of Clause 3 of this Bill, it is seen that the authority is being vested with the Central Government. Clause 3 says, "The Central Government shall take all such measures, as it deems necessary, or, expedient for regulation of coastal aquaculture by prescribing guidelines, to ensure that coastal

aquaculture does not cause any detriment to the coastal environment..." So, an authority is being vested with the Central Government by virtue of Clause 3 of this Bill. At the same time, Clause 11—Powers and Functions of Authority—is also saying the same thing. Clause 11 (1)(a) says, "to make regulations for the construction and operation of aquaculture farms within the coastal areas". Clause 11(1)(b) says, "to inspect coastal aquaculture farms with a view to ascertaining their environmental impact caused by coastal aquaculture". So, my doubt or apprehension is: When an Aquaculture Authority or an independent regulatory authority, is being provided for in the Bill with the functions of regulating the coastal aquaculture, what is the significance of Clause 3 again giving powers to the Government of India or the Central Government so as to regulate the coastal aquaculture? This is my apprehension which I would like to make in respect of the implementation of this Bill. I would like to support this Bill because I know that more than three lakh people are working in aquaculture farms and a huge investment is also being made. At that time, there was no proper regulation or there was no proper guidelines how to protect the environment and all these things. Now, after having experiences of all these things, the hon. Minister has come forward with the Bill with safeguard like environment protection. So, I would like to support the Bill. But I would, once again, urge the hon. Minister and the Ministry that strong measures and stringent measures should be taken because any dilution of this thing will have very serious repercussions in the coastal areas. So, it should be borne in mind that no liberal approach and attitude should be taken so as to help industrialists to make huge profits. So, it should be borne in mind, especially as Shri Narayanasamy has just said after the experience of the Tsunami such care, caution and stringent measures have to be kept in mind while implementing this Bill. With these words, I support it. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, there are three more speakers. We will, first complete the Bill, and then adjourn for the lunch.

SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the environment protection should be the prime aim of this Bill, but when we view the Bill there is nothing regarding protection of the environment. Regarding certain restrictions which are given in this Bill, there is only one thing that is shown in Clause 13(8)(a).

No coastal aquaculture shall be carried on within two hundred metres from the High Tide Lines" and (b)" No coastal aquaculture shall be carried

on in the creeks, rivers and backwaters within the Coastal Regulation Zone declared for the time being under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986". Except this, nothing more is given regarding restrictions in this particular Bill. Therefore, the simple thing happening is creation of a new authority and giving employment to some people. That is the only thing that is happening. It can very well be done by amending the Environment Protection Act, 1986, itself and including a clause that permission has to be given under certain circumstances for this particular coastal aquaculture. Except that, Sir, no protection is given for the agriculturists. The problem throughout the coastal area is that some companies like M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited, are concentrating upon this particular profession. Certain people, who knew that banks were giving money, started this business, but they failed in the business. They could not compete with the market price. Therefore, everyone has gone except the companies, which have got some money, or which can, by some book-keeping methods, show some loss and other things. They are spoiling the entire coastal area. Wherever this particular work was started, in that area, drinking water has become saline. Villagers in that area are suffering. In the same way, those areas, where these types of farms were developed, have become non-agricultural land and agriculturists are going away from the villages. No compensation provision has been provided for. Suppose, these particular people are allowed to have the same venture after some time, say after five years or so, if they go away from that venture, what will happen? Those lands will become non-agricultural land. Nobody is going to use them. We may be earning crores of rupees, but what is the loss that we are causing to our motherland. Entire coastal area is going to become fallow land, sandy land and the level of underground drinking water is also going down. In my own constituency, that is, Sivaganga Parliamentary constituency, from where I stood for my last term, that area Ramnad district, throught out that coastal area, these aquaculture farms were created. The entire area, which was having very good water for the drinking purpose, now has become saline. They are conducting a study there itself. The State Government is also not at all caring about those people. The drinking water is now sold for five rupees for ordinary villagers because of these matters. Therefore, the agriculturists are now going away from these coastal areas. We can very easily find out these facts from my area itself, from Ramnad district, and the coastal area of S.P. Pattinam to the Tondi coastal area and other places, like Nambudalai. Therefore, I would like to suggest that the

Government should take care of the agriculturists first. Then, they have to take care whether the drinking water is going to be spoiled or not. When the hard water, the saline water comes inside, automatically, it goes and fills up inland also. It goes even to the level of 60 kilometres inside the land. I can very well say that even it has come to the level of 90 kilometres through Sivaganga. Now, this area, Sivaganga, has also become saline because it goes to the backwater, it goes down and it becomes saline water. Therefore, this is the thing for which environmentalists are agitating. Sarvodaya people are conducting a lot of agitation throughout India. Are we going to protect these coastal areas from the havoc which is going to be caused to the environment. Then, there is a provision given for the appointment of an Authority. It prescribes that the Authority, which gives qualification, which is in clause 4(3) sub-clause (a), "The Chairpersons who is, or has been, a Judge of a High Court". My submission is that if that type of provision is given even in the Constitution, there is another clause, "A person qualified to be". That means, a person, who is a practising advocate, who has above qualification, can also be appointed as the Chairman. This clause is left out. Of course for the last four years, subsequently in every Bill that clause has been included. Therefore, that clause should be included here also.

Sir, Now I come to the issue of representation. The Standing Committee also wants to give representation to others. But I would like to request that the Committee should consist of agriculturists in that area. They should be co-opted. When licence is asked for in that particular area, then the area Panchayat, the local Panchayati Raj institutions should be represented. They should get the clearance and normally they would get it. They should be represented when they are deciding it. Also, the neighbourhood agriculturists should be heard, they should get the permission in writing and they should be compensated if something wrong has happened to them. Therefore, simply having some rotational method and having four members to represent the coastal area on rotation basis means somebody will be sitting there but he will not be concerned about these agriculturists.

As far as registration is concerned, no doubt, it is given there. There may be an existing form, and therefore, a provision is made. In clause 13(2), a person who is continuing the business, even without registration he can continue for three months. This provision will be exploited, throught out, by the people who want to have the illegal aquaculture.

Sir, in the same way, I would like to mention about the punishment provision. When we go to section 15 of the Environment Protection Act

1956, 5 years' punishment and one lakh of rupees as fine is given, and also the continuance will be compensated by way of Rs. 5,000 per day. But now, here, in Clause 14, they want to give punishment only for a period of three years and one lakh of rupess as fine, and there is no fine for continuance. They also want to restrict the public to go to the courts against these types of activities. Therefore, a provision has been given in section 15 that no court shall take cognizance of an offence under section 14 without a written complaint filed by an officer of the Authority authorised in this behalf by it. This means the cognizance of the offence is now being taken away, as written complaint by an authorised officer is now the only basis, allowing the ordinary agriculturists or environmentalists from not seeking the help of court of law. All other provisions are rule-making provisions and they have made them part of the section.

Finally, they have given another exemption in Clause 27, "notwithstanding anything contained in clause (v) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Environment (Protection) Act....". They want to give those powers also. Therefore, when they are giving powers to the Authority of the Environment Protection Act, then why should not there be a simple amendment. Sir, even though I support the Bill brought before this august House, at the same time, I would request the hon. Minister and the Government to protect the interests of the agriculturists. The Government should also protect the sea-life that also will be spoiled by putting the chemicals during this formation of particular aqua-culture farm. With these words, I thank you for having given me an opportunity to speak on this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Seelam, would you like to participate in the discussion, or, you just want to support it?

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I rise to support this Bill but, though you, I would like to apprise the hon. Members about the plight of the farmers of aquaculture because we have certain concerns. Sir, in the last ten years, this aquaculture has assumed a very significant role especially in the coastal regions of Andhra Pradesh like Guntur, Krishna, East-Godavari and Eluru, etc. from where I come. Sir, ten years back, if you kindly recall, as I was telling, because of the neglect of agriculture, because of non-investment in the agriculture sector, many farmers were given to take up cash crop cultivation. As a part of this tendency, they started aquaculture near the creek waters - the water where the seawaters meet the fresh water - on the banks of the Krishna and near the Buckingham Canal. Lakhs and Lakhs of acres have been brought into aquaculture in that region. In the initial stages, because of the freshness of the soil,

because of the absence of virus, the results were encouraging. This was the main source of employment generation even to the educated also. A lot of fishermen were also getting benefited and a large number of agricultural labourers started getting employed in this sector. Not only the big farmers, even the small and the marginal farmers also took to aquaculture. What happened is, over a period of, say, 10 years, the situation is qualitatively changed. There is a crisis in this sector. The initial results were very good. But, later on, this is what is called the tendency of the farmers, if one farmer starts the cold-storage and he gets success, everybody goes for the same thing, there is a mushrooming of aquaculture. The small farmers sold their little land. They either purchased the land or took it on lease. The investment was very heavy because of the CRZ, the coastal regulatory zone. It was prescribed that near 500 meters, nothing can be cultivated. But, in practice, the revenue authorities did permit it in the earlier stages because the creek waters were available, the waters where the fresh water and the salt water properly mix, were available within the 500 meters. Once they dig bore wells or arrange for fresh waters, the revenue authorities started harassing. This is one area. Secondly, the price, especially, of the prawn is very fluctuating in the international market. This is mainly sent to Japan and other markets. Because of the anti-dumping laws, the export duty was raised to discourage the Indian prawn, they say that qualitatively, it is of a slightly lower grade. Again, the MPEDA, Marine Products Exports Development Authority, did take some steps. But its intervention was not up to the mark, as expected by the farmers, number one, in the area of research and development, number two, in the area of scientific management of the aquaculture farming. Because of the mushrooming, because of the non-scientific method of cultivation, the yield and the productivity is reduced, the cultivation became very costly, and the bankers, who were very enthusiastic in the initial years, because of the low returns, have started going back. They are not encouraging them now. So, the end result is that those who showed enthusiasm in the initial years, they have got beaten because of losses. Those vast stretches of land have become totally useless because they cannot produce any other crop because of salinity. Sir, for bringing them back to cultivation, say, for instance if we want to grow rice, we have to treat them with gypsum. With one coat of gypsum you have to keep for six months with watering; then second coat of gypsum is needed to desalinated that land. Then only, any crop can be grown. Now, the problem is whoever have left, have left. At least, the people, who are still cultivating, need to be supported by proper intervention. One there is a need to reduce this 500 metre-zone, because you really do not

have the creek water outside that; it falls within that 500 meters. Because it falls in the CRZ (Coastal Regulatory Zone), the bankers are not giving any assistance to farmers. These are some of the problems and some of the issues being faced by them. We need more interventions by MPEDA for proper guidance, just like we do for intense agriculture. They need guidance. Proper scientific management should be there, and that is possible only with the intervention of the Government. The hon. Minister, who is at the helm of affairs, is well-versed with these problems of aquaculture farming. The farming community, especially those who are engaged in aquaculture farming, is expecting a lot from the hon. Minister. We need this distance to be reduced; the loans to be expedited by proper intervention; and special emphasis should be given to the existing industry. That is what I wanted to say. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI VASANT CHAVAN (Maharashtra): Thank you, Sir, forgiving me this opportunity. Sir, at the very outset, I congratulate the Minister, Shri Sharad Pawarji, for bringing this Bill to this august House. At least after ten years, since the Supreme Court had given the judgement in 1994, the Bill has come to this House; it was lingering for the last five years in Committees and sometimes in the House. Finally, the community of fishermen in India, particularly in coastal areas, will find an outlet of a Bill, outlet of a law, by which they can operate correctly. The judgement created a panic. It has created an atmosphere that all aquaculture farms, except traditional and improved traditional in the coastal areas shall be closed; it shall not give permission to any other new farm to come and if at all it comes, it has to go through very strict regulations, very strict conditions. Nearly 4,00,000-5,00,000 people were dependent on this business - three lakh officially. But there are more people. Who did not come forward, the Government might not have counted them. A large population is dependent on this business, particularly in southern area. We are worried about it. So, the Government came in between and brought this legislation. The hon. Minister had pondered over it very specifically and brought this Authority. The Authority has been given very wide powers, and when wide
powers are there, naturally, they have to be used very carefully.

Clause 11 of the Bill provides that the Authority shall have various functions *inter alia*, to make regulations for construction and operation of aquaculture farms; their registration; their removal; their demolition fox specific reasons, and many other conditions to be laid upon. The Government was worried about the fishermen community and the business

also. My State of Maharashtra has also nearly 800 KMs length of coastal area. I would be thankful if the Authority can take a programme to help other areas where there is no aquaculture farming. I would like to know whether it can give some financial assistance, or whether it can sponsor some programmes.

At the same time, I also request that cooperatives should be given some preference in this matter. Private individuals, private companies and private sector are there, but the base is fishermen. So, fishermen cooperatives are brought and Government tries for it, gives possession to them, gives concessions to them. Then, the whole picture will change to some extent because it is export-oriented business and this business has bright future. It can expand much better. So, naturally it should be looked at with some modern attitude. Regulating the whole matter by legislation and by an authority is essential, as the Supreme Court has given decision. But apart from it, if the Government plans out for the expansion of this business for the coastal people; for the enhancement of this business for the coastal people, gives inspiration to cooperatives and gives inspiration to other coastal belts where this business can be floated, I shall be thankful for that.

श्री शरद पवार: महोदय, मुझे खुशी है कि कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कई अच्छे सुझाव और सूचनाएं इस अथॉरिटी के अमल में करने की आवश्यकता है, इस बारे में दिए । यह बात सच है, जैसा मैंने शुरू में कहा कि 6000 करोड़ का एक्सपोर्ट आज इस क्षेत्र का है, मगर साथ-साथ यह बात भी सच है कि आज कई नए देश, इस क्षेत्र में, बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर आगे आ रहे है। वियतनाम जैसा देश, जो हमसे बहुत छोटा देश है, मगर पिछले दो- तीन सालों में इसक्षेत्र में उसने जो काम किया है, इससे उसका एक्सपोर्ट हमसे ज्यादा बढ़ गया है। अभी कुछ हफ्ते पहले मुझे चीन जाने का मौका मिला और इस क्षेत्र में चीन क्या करता है, वह देखने का भी मुझे मौका मिला। मेरे सामने यह बात आई कि चीन ने इस क्षेत्र में बहुत अच्छा काम किया है और दुनिया में अपना स्थान प्रस्थापित करने के लिए उसकी कोशिश बड़े पैमाने पर जारी है। यह सब देखने के बाद, इतना बड़ा सागरी किनारा हिंदुस्तान में होने के बावजूद, अगर हम इस पर ध्यान नहीं देंगे, इसकी रक्षा नहीं करेंगे, इसको बढ़ावा नहीं देंगे और बढ़ावा देते समय हम environment, प्रोटैक्ट करने की ओर भी ध्यान नहीं देंगे, तो मुझे लगता है कि इस क्षेत्र में दुनिया जो आगे जा रही है, इससे बड़ा मौका भारत को जो मिल सकता है, वह शायद हम खो देंगे। इसलिए कई सालों से यह समस्या इस क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले लोगों के सामने थी और कई सालों से इस तरह की अथॉरिटी या बिल लाने की कोशिश हो रही थी, इस पर हम कामयाब नहीं हुए। मगर मुझे खुशी है कि यू0 पी0 ए0 सरकार ने अपने हाथ में जिम्मेदारी लेने के बाद जिन क्षेत्रों को बढ़ावा देने की बात की थी, इसमें एक्वाकल्चर एक ऐसा क्षेत्र है, जो देश को सम्पत्ति भी दे सकता है, अनाज में वृद्धि भी कर सकता है और साथ-साथ सागरी

किनारे पर रहने वाले लोगों को एक तरह की रोज़ी भी दे सकता है, इसलिए इस बिल को जल्दी से जल्दी सदन के सामने लाने का प्रयास किया गया। हम यह भी सोचते हैं कि जहां खास तौर पर एक फसल लेने की आदत है, वह भी धान की फसल हो, आप देखेंगे, कि एक फसल लेने वाला जितना क्षेत्र हिंदुस्तान में है, वहां गरीबी सबसे ज्यादा है। वहां किसानों की स्थिति ठीक नहीं है और इसलिए कोस्टल एरिया में जहां सिर्फ सिंगल फसल लेने की परिस्थिति है, इन लोगों को एक तरह से नए धंधे में जाने के लिए, मदद करने की आवश्यकता है। इनके लिए शायद एक्वाकल्चर ऐसी लाइन हो सकती है,जिससे उनको आर्थिक ताकत मिल सकती है। उनकी परिस्थितियों में सुधार है, वे पहले से ज्यादा उत्पादन देश और समाज के लिए कर सकते हैं, इसलिए ऐसे सभी कामों पर ज्यादा ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। इसको देखकर सरकार ने यह सोचा है कि जैसे कई साल से देश में दूध की कमी थी, दूध बाल-बच्चों के लिए बहुत ही आवश्यक चीज है, देश में इसका उत्पादन कम था । जब लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी देश के प्रधानमंत्री थे तब उन्होंने नेशनल डेयरी डेवलपमेंट बोर्ड नाम की एक संस्था की स्थापना करने के लिए तय किया। उन्होंने डॉ0 कुरियन को यह जिम्मेदारी दे दी । इसके लिए भारत सरकार ने बहुत बड़ी राशि भी दे दी और देश के बाहर से भी थोड़ी मदद आ गई। इससे पूरे देश में ऑपरेशन फ्लड नाम की एक योजना इंट्रोडयूज की गई। आज हम देखते हैं कि दुनिया में सबसे ज्यादा दूध का उत्पादन करने वाला देश भारत ,एक नम्बर का देश बन गया है। यह परिस्थिति दूध के क्षेत्र में हो सकती है तो हम कह सकते हैं कि एक्वाकल्चर के माध्यम से, चाहे कोस्टल एरिया में हो, चाहे मेरीन सैक्टर मे हो, जैसे एन0 डी0 बी0 की लाइन पर,हम पर इन्फास्ट्रक्चर तय करेंगे, तो यह नई लाइन डेवलप करने में बहुत मदद हो जाएगी । इससे देश का एक्सपोर्ट भी बढ़ सकता है और लोगों को रोजी भी मिल सकती है। इस तरह का एक प्रस्ताव मिनिस्ट्री ने तैयार किया है। हमारी यह कोशिश है और हो सकता है कि इसी साल एन0 डी0 डी0 बी0 पेटर्न पर फिशरी डेवलपमेंट के लिए, एक्वाक्लचर डेवलपमेंट के लिए एक नया इन्फास्ट्रक्चर, नई संस्था, हम तैयार करना चाहते हैं। हम इसे सभी क्षेत्रों में बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं। मुझे विश्वास है कि इससाल इसका काम शुरू हो सकता है। यहां पर जो कुछ सवाल उठाए गए हैं, एक तो अथोरिटी की बात है, यह बात तो साफ है कि सेट्रल गवर्नमेंट अथॉरिटी की जिम्मेदारी ले सकती है, मगर अथोरिटी भी कुछ तय करने के बाद इस पर अमल करने के बाद, हमें स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की मदद लेनी पड़ेगी। इसमें स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के को- ऑपरेशन की बहुत आवश्यकता है। इसकी पूरी जिम्मेदारी केन्द्र सरकार, नजरअंदाज नहीं कर सकती । यहां पर एक चिंता जताई गई कि इस क्षेत्र में मल्टी नेशतल कंपनियां आएंगी। आप यह नजरअंदाज नहीं कर सकते कि इस क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले लोगों का क्षेत्र,90 प्रतिशत लोगों का क्षेत्र, दो हैक्टेयर के अंदर है। दो हैक्टेयर के अंदर कोई मल्टी नेशनल कंपनी के यहां आने की परिस्थिति नहीं है। जहां तक फिशरमैन कोस्टल एरिया की कम्युनिटी है, उनके इन्टरेस्ट सेफगार्ड करने की बात यहां कही गई है। यह बिल्कुल बराबर है, मगर मैं विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं कि क्लॉज-3 में, जो रूल तैयार करने के बारे में प्रोविजन है, इस रूल के माध्यम से फिशरमैन

के हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए खास ध्यान दिया जाएगा। जैसा कि ड्रिंकिंग वाटर के बारे में कहा गया है और एनवायरेनमेंट के बारे में भी यहां कुछ सुझाव दिए हैं। मैं सदन को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हम कलॉज-3 में जो लाइन तय करेंगे, इन गाइड लाइन्स में, एनवायरेनमेंट प्रोटेक्शन की बातों, ड्रिंकिंग वाटर की बातों और फिशरमैन के हितों की ओर जरूर ध्यान दिया जाएगा। यहां पर एक सवाल उठाया गया है कि मेंगरो सॉयल के ऊपर कुछ बुरा असर हो जाएगा। मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि मेंगरों पर इसका कोई असर होने वाला नहीं है,क्योंकि मेंगरो सॉयल एसिडिटी में होती है। जहां पर मेंगरो प्लांटेशन है, वह सॉयल, एक्वाकलचर के लिए बिल्कुल मददगार नहीं हो सकती है, इसलिए इस पर कोई एकवाकल्चर के लिए जाने की संभावना नहीं है। यहां पर किसानों की अथॉरिटी पर एक रिप्रजेंटेशन देने की बात कही गई है कि सैक्शन-11 (9) में,आपने देखा होगा कि वहां 4 मैम्बर्स, कोस्टल एरिया के होंगे, कोस्टल स्टेटों के होंगे,इसमें उनको रिप्रजेंटेशन दिया है। कोस्टल स्टेट के जो चार प्रतिनिधि इसमें आएंगे, उसमें किसान आ सकते है। जो खुद इस तरह के फार्म चलाते है, उनको भी इसमें रिप्रेजेन्टेशन देने की कोशिश की जाएगी। आज के इन सभी क्षेत्रों की जो स्थिति है, उसके बारे में भी बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। यह बात सच है कि एक जमाने में,खास तौर से प्रकाश्म् बाकी सभी डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स में, तमिलनाडु में, केरल में, सभी क्षेत्रों में तेजी थी, ठीक कीमत मिलती थी। मगर आज क्षेत्र बढ़ गया है, दुनिया में कंपीटीशन बढ़ गया है, पिछले कई सालों में वहां ठीक कीमत नहीं मिल रही है, इसकी भी शिकायतें आती है। इसका कोई रास्ता निकालना है तो हमें अपना एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ाना होगा। एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ाने के लिए अपीडा की एक खास ऑर्गेनाइजेशन भारत सरकार ने बनाई है। जो बिल मैं सदन के सामने लाया हूं, यह बिल, जहां तक कीमत की बात है, इसमें इस पर ध्यान नहीं दे सकते, यह बिल का काम नहीं है। अगर इसके लिए अलग से कई इंतजाम करने की आवश्यकता है, तो अपीडा के माध्यम से एक्सपोर्ट को ज्यादा बढ़ावा देने पर ध्यान दे सकते हैं। मैंने शुरू में ही कहा कि एन0 डी0 डी0 बी0 की लाइन पर हम यहां हम एक दूसरी आर्गेनाइजेशन बनाना चाहते हैं। इसमें प्रोडक्शन को प्रोत्साहन देने, साथ ही इसकी मार्केटिंग और प्रोसेसिंग के लिए भी कुछ इंतजाम करने पर ध्यान दिया जाएगा। आज जो समस्या पैदा हुई है, हम उससे छुटकारा दिलाने की कोशिश करेंगे। यहां एक और समस्या के बारे में बताया कि इसमें क्लॉज 3 और क्लॉज 11 में कुछ कंट्राडिक्शन है। सच बताऊं तो यहां ऐसा कोई कंट्राडिक्शन नहीं है। अथॉरिटी की जो कुछ गाइडलाइन्स दी जाएगी, उसे उन्हीं गाइडलाइंन्स के माध्यम से काम करना होगा, इसलिए इसमें कंट्राडिक्शन की कोई परिस्थिति नहीं है। नारायणसामी जी ने पूछा कि सपोज अथॉरिटी ने किसी का रजिस्ट्रेशन रिफ्यूज किया, तो क्या अपील के लिए कोई सुविधा नहीं है, तो क्लॉज 13 (11) में, जिसमें रिन्यूअल की सुविधा है, Refusal can be done after giving an opportunity of hearing. इसमें इसके बारे में साफ प्रोविजन है, इसलिए इसकी चिंता करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

अच्छे पानी, फ्रेश वाटर का यहां इस्तेमाल हो जाएगा, इसके बारे में भी कुछ बताया गया है। मगर ग्राउंड वाटर, एक्वाकल्चर के लिए, प्रोहिबिट करने के लिए हम गाइडलाइंस में प्रोविजन कर सकते

हैं । हम यह जानते है कि अच्छा पानी, ग्राउंड वाटर का इस्तेमाल एक्वाकल्चर के लिए करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है और करना भी नहीं चाहिए। लेकिन इसका कहीं न कहीं प्रोहिबिशन करनाहो, तो हम गाइडलाइन में इस पर ध्यान दे सकते हैं। इसमें जो कुछ सुधार करने की आवश्यकता है, उसे हम जरूर देखेंगे।

यहां बताया गया है कि कस्टल एरिया में काफी जमीन सेलाइन हो गई है। यह जो जमीन सेलाइन हो गई है, इसकी जिम्मेदारी हम एक्वाकल्चर पर नहीं डाल सकते है। जो जमीन पहले ही सेलाइन हो गई है, एक्वाकल्चर को बढ़ावा देने से उसे कुछ नुकसान होगा, ऐसा मुझे नहीं लगता है। वसंत चवहाण जी ने कहा कि को- ऑपरेटिव इंस्टीटयूशन्स को यहां एन्क्रेज करने के लिए, थोड़ी सुविधा देने की आवश्यकता है या खास तौर पर कुछ करने की आवश्यकता है। इस संदर्भ में मैं यह आश्वासन सदन को देता हूं कि जब हम रूल्स तैयार करेंगे तो इस पर जरूर ध्यान देंगे। जहां तक खराब सीड्स खराब मेडिसिन के बारे में यहां कहा गया, उस संदर्भ में मैं इतना ही कह सकता हूं कि बिल इसकी जिम्मेदारी नहीं ले सकता । हम रूल्स पर ध्यान देंगे, लेकिन साथ ही हमारे देश में और भी कानून है, जो अडल्ट्रेशन या इस तरह के काम करते हैं, उन्हें कंट्रोल करन के लिए कुछ न कुछ प्रावधान कानून में है, इसका यहां इस्तेमाल हो सकता है। इसका इस्तेमाल यहां हो सकता है। मगर इसक्षेत्र में कोई संशोधन नहीं होता, रिसर्च नहीं होता, यह बात सच नहीं है। इंडियन काउंसिल फॉर एग्रीकल्चर रिसर्च में इसी क्षेत्र में बहुत बड़ा काम शुरू है। यहां तक काम हुआ है कि इसमें ट्रांसजेनिक जीन का इस्तेमाल करके एक अच्छी क्वालिटी की सीड इस देश में तैयार करने में हम लोग कामयाब हो रहे हैं। जो काम दुनिया के कई देशों में नहीं हुआ, वह यहां हो रहा है। मुझे विश्वास है कि एक साल-दो साल में इसका प्रसार देश के सभी एक्वाकल्चर के सेक्टर में काम करने वाले किसानों के घर में, इनके क्षेत्र में हो जाएगा। जहां तक मेडिसीन, इसके उत्पादन और इसकी क्वालिटी की बात है, इन सभी में आज इंडियन काउंसिल फॉर एग्रीकल्चर रिसर्च ने बड़ा ध्यान दिया है और इसमें बड़ी कामयाबी इस ऑरगेनाइजेशन को मिली है, जिसका फायदा इन सभी किसानों को अवश्य मिलेगा। इसलिए जहां तक सीड की बात है, जहां तक फीड की बात है और जहां तक मेडिसीन की बात है, इन तीनों क्षेत्रों में हमारा ध्यान रहेगा। यह विश्वास मैं सदन को दिलाना चाहता हूं। यह कदम उठाने की आवश्यकता इससे पहले ही थी। इसमें डिले हो गया । मगर सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने जो गाइडलाईन दी, इनवायरनमेंट प्रोटैक्ट करने के लिए उन्होंने सुझाव दिया और साथ-साथ किसानों के हितों की रक्षा करने की भी आवश्यकता है। इसको इंडस्ट्री के नाम पर ट्रीट करके सीआरजेड में ला कर इस पर एक पांबदी लाने की जो बात थी, इन सभी से रास्ता निकालने की कोशिश इस बिल में की गई है। मुझे विश्वास है कि यह अथॉरिटी इन सभी क्षेत्रों में ध्यान देगी और जो समस्या आई है, उसे दूर करने के लिए इस अथॉरिटी की और बिल की मदद इस क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले सभी लोगों को मिलेगी और एक नया क्षेत्र देश के सामने, खास तौर पर कोस्टल एरिया में, आज आएगा, जिसका फायदा समाज के गरीब लोगों को, समाज के बेरोजगार लोगों को और एक्सपोर्ट करने के लिए देश को एक नया मौका देने के लिए इसमें जरूर होगा। इसलिए मुझे विश्वास है कि सदन इसको पारित करेगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the Motion to vote. The question is:

'That the Bill to provide for the establishment of a Coastal Aquaculture Authority for regulating the activities connected with coastal aquaculture in the coastal areas and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration." *The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 27 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause 1 for cosideration. There is one amendment by the Minister.

Clause 1-Short title anti-commencement.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: Sir, I beg to move:

"That at page 1, line 5, for the figure "2004" the figure "2005" be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the Enacting Formula for consideration. There is one amendment by the Minister.

Enacting Formula

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: Sir, I beg to move:

That at page 1, line 1 for the word "Fifty-fifth" the word "Fifty-sixth" be substituted.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at forty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at forty-one minutes past two of the clock.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up discussion on the working of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution. Shri Uday Pratap Singh to raise the discussion. But where is the Whip? There is no Cabinet Minister.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, the Minister is here.

श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद, उपसभापति जी। यह एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है जिस पर आपने इस बहस को शुरू करने की अनुमति दी है।

जैसाकि अभी आपने कहा, यहां महत्वपूर्ण लोगों को होना चाहिए था, तो मेरे मन में यह सवाल आया और उसे मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूं। यह बहस आम तौर से दो तरह की होती है----एक तो निर्गुण बहस होती है और दूसरी सगुण बहस होती है। अगर निर्गुण बहस हो और कबीर की भाषा में बोला जाये तो कुछ समझ में आया, कुछ नहीं आया, लेकिन वास्तव में आज जो बहस होनी है, वह हिंदुस्तान के लाखों गरीबों और गरीबी रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले लोगों से संबंधित है। []गरीबी रेखा[] यह शब्द भी बहुत प्राचीन हो गया है। आज के संदर्भ में इसका मतलब ही नहीं रह गया है। माननीय उपसभापति जी, आज सुदूर गांवों में ऐसे-ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्हें तीन-तीन दिन खाना नहीं मिलता। महोदय, मेरे पास विभिन्न अखबारों की कटिंग्स है जिनमें यह लिखा हुआ है कि पब्लिक डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम का 67 प्रतिशत सामान चोरी चला जाता है। किसी-किसी में यह लिखा है कि अंत्योदय स्कीम और जो गरीबों को अन्न पहुंचाने वाली स्कीम है, अगर इन्हें बंद कर दिया जाए तो उससे ज्यादा लोगों का हित होगा क्योंकि इन के चलते उन लोगों का ज्यादा नुकसान हो रहा है।

उपसभापति जी, मेरे पास ऐसी कम-से-कम 10-20 प्रकार की खबरें हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि बफर स्टॉक बनाने से लेकर, एफ0 सी0 आई0 के गोदामों में रख –रखाव अन्न की खरीदारी और वितरण प्रणाली के द्वारा उसे गरीबों तके पहुंचाए जाने का मसला एक विषय है और कंजूमर्स जो गरीबी रेखा के नीचे नहीं है, उनके लिए मसला दूसरा है। मैं इन दोनों पर अलग-अलग बात करना चाहता हूं। हमारी सरकार के आंकड़ों के हिसाब से 17 करोड़ परिवार भारतवर्ष में गरीबी रेखा के